UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,603	07/20/2006	Appukuttan Nair Sreekumaran	P-8924-US	5956
	7590 04/13/200 <b>dek Latzer, LLP</b>	EXAMINER		
1500 Broadway			SAVAGE, MATTHEW O	
12th Floor New York, NY 10036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/586,603	SREEKUMARAN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew O. Savage	1797
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 Margon</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This      Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are withdra  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acceedable and any objection to the content of the content o	relection requirement. r. epted or b)□ objected to by the B	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7-20-06, 11-10-08.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	nte

Applicant's election of the mixture of gold and silver nanoparticles, the mixture of activated alumina and magnesia, the powder, and activated carbon in the reply filed on 3-2-09 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinig, Jr..

With respect to claim 1, Heinig discloses silver deposited on activated alumina, the silver obviously being in the form of nanoparticles having a size up to 150 nm since it is in a colloidal form and is deposited on the alumina using a method that is similar to that disclosed in the instant specification (see lines 6-40 of col. 6).

Concerning claim 3, Heinig fails to specify the activated alumina and other substrates as being in the form of powder, however, such a modification would have been obvious in order to maximize the surface area of the adsorbent for a particular application.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya et al.

With respect to claim 1, Kamiya et al disclose silver deposited on activated alumina, the silver obviously being in the form of nanoparticles having a size up to 150 nm since it is deposited on the alumina using a method that is similar to that disclosed in the instant specification (see from line 61 of col. 2 to line 19 of col. 3).

Concerning claim 3, Kamiya et al fail to specify the activated alumina as being in the form of powder, however, such a modification would have been obvious in order to maximize the surface area of the adsorbent for a particular application.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yan.

With respect to claims 1-2, Yan discloses gold and silver deposited on activated alumina (see from line 56 of col. 3 to line 16 of col. 4), the gold and silver obviously being in the form of nanoparticles having a size up to 150 nm since it is deposited on the alumina using a method that is similar to that disclosed in the instant specification (see lines 10-36 of col. 6).

Concerning claim 3, Yan fails to specify the activated alumina as being in the form of powder, however, such a modification would have been obvious in order to maximize the surface area of the adsorbent for a particular application.

Regarding claim 4, Yan includes activated carbon (see line 61 of col. 3).

Art Unit: 1797

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew O. Savage whose telephone number is (571) 272-1146. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew O Savage/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1797

mos